UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/792,031	03/02/2004	Kenneth C. Kennedy II	10000/303	1370

757 7590 11/30/2010

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER	
PATEL, SHEFALI DILIP	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3767	
MAIL DATE	**DELIVERY MODE**
11/30/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/792,031	KENNEDY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SHEFALI D. PATEL	3767	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 September 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,9,10,12 and 16-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *26-32* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,9,10,12 and 16-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *04/07/2010*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgments

1. In the reply, filed on September 30, 2010, Applicant amended claims 1, 12, and 16.

2. Applicant cancelled claims 11 and 15.

3. In the non-final rejection of March 31, 2010, Examiner objected to claim 1 for a minor informality. Applicant amended claim 1. Objection is withdrawn.

4. Examiner rejected claims 12 and 19 under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant amended claim 1 to provide clarity for the subject matter of claim 12. Applicant states that claim 1 does not positively recite "an inflation device", hence, claim 12 can introduce "an inflation device". Rejection is withdrawn.

5. Currently, claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, and 16-25 are under examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In regards to claim 1, in the limitation "wherein the distal end portion of the catheter is in sliding engagement with the stiffening member…", the new phrase "without inhibiting axial movement of the stiffening member relative to the distal end portion of the catheter" appears to be new matter as it is not stated or described within the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 12, 16-19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell (US 6,135,982), and further in view of Miraki (US 5,318,535) and Walker et al (US 5,454,788).

In regards to claim 1, Campbell teaches a balloon catheter (Figures 1-6, balloon catheter [2]) comprising:

a. an inflatable balloon (balloon [20]) comprising a balloon wall defining an interior volume, the balloon further comprising a distal end (distal end portion [26]), a proximal end (proximal end portion [24]), and a central portion disposed therebetween, the distal end comprising a tubular sleeve (tip [22]) defining a

passageway extending partially there through, the passageway terminating in a closed distal terminus

b. a catheter (catheter body [12] with flexible body portion [14]) comprising a distal end portion and a proximal end portion, the proximal end portion comprising a connector (coupling [16]) configured to engage an inflation device (inflation/deflation controller [32]), the distal end portion fixedly connected to the proximal end of the balloon [20], and a lumen extending through the catheter along an axis thereof and in fluid communication with the interior volume of the balloon

c. a stiffening member (core wire [46] with spanning region [18]) comprising a distal portion extending distally from the distal end portion of the catheter [14] and through the interior volume of the balloon [20], the stiffening member comprising a proximal portion extending through the lumen of the catheter and being fixedly and non-removably connected to the catheter at one or more locations, the distal portion of the stiffening member being non-fixedly connected to the distal end of the balloon (column 4, lines 1-10)

d. wherein movement of the distal end [26] of the balloon [20] relative to the proximal end [24] of the balloon is not restrained by the catheter [14] (Figures 2-4)

e. wherein axial movement of the distal end [26] of the balloon [20] relative to the proximal end [24] of the balloon in a direction generally parallel to the axis of the catheter is not restrained by the stiffening member [18] (Figures 2-4)

f. wherein the distal portion of the stiffening member [18] comprises a distal end that is disposed within the passageway of the sleeve [22] and is in slidable engagement with an interior surface of the sleeve, the distal end being spaced proximally from the distal terminus of the passageway so as to permit axial movement of the distal end of the balloon [20] relative to the stiffening member (Figures 2-6)

g. wherein the sleeve [22] comprises a cannula (hypotube [54]) disposed therein, the cannula having an interior surface defining a cross-sectional area that is less than an interior cross-sectional area of the sleeve, the interior surface of the cannula being configured to slidingly engage an exterior surface of the stiffening member [18] (Figures 5-5A)

h. wherein transverse movement of the distal end [26] of the balloon [20] relative to the proximal end [24] of the balloon in a direction generally perpendicular to the axis of the catheter is continuously restrained by lateral engagement between the interior surface of the sleeve [22] and the distal portion of the stiffening member [18] (Figures 2-6)

Campbell does not teach that the one or more locations that the stiffening member is fixedly and non-removably connected to the catheter at is proximal of the distal end portion of the catheter, since Campbell teaches that said one or more locations is at the distal end portion of the catheter (Figures 5-5A)(column 4, lines 1-10). Miraki teaches a balloon catheter (Figures 5-7, balloon catheter [10]) wherein the proximal portion of a stiffening member (guide wire [12]) is not fixedly and non-removably connected to a catheter (shaft [32]) at the distal end portion of the catheter. It would have been obvious

to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the proximal portion of a stiffening member, of the catheter of Campbell, to be not fixedly and non-removably connected to a catheter the distal end portion of the catheter, as taught by Miraki, as the sliding engagement between the distal end of the catheter and the stiffening member will allow the stiffening member to be freely movable axially for efficiently guiding the catheter to a target site in a patient's body (column 8, lines 60-63). Also, as an alternative, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made could easily have moved the fixed and non-removable connection (coupling [48]) between the stiffening member and the distal end portion of the catheter, of Campbell, from the distal end portion of the catheter to the proximal end portion of the catheter, in order to provide more flexibility to the distal end portion of the catheter since the stiffening member is not fixed or providing much rigidity at the distal end portion of the catheter. It is well-known in the art for catheters to have flexible distal end portions for easy manipulation within a patient's body vessel.

In further regards to claim 1, Campbell does not teach that the distal end portion of the catheter is in sliding engagement with the stiffening member, since Campbell teaches that the distal end of the catheter [14] is fixedly connected to the stiffening member [46] (column 4, lines 1-7). Miraki teaches a balloon catheter (Figures 5-7, balloon catheter [10]) wherein the distal end of a catheter (shaft [32]) is in sliding engagement with a stiffening member (guide wire [12]). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the distal end, of the catheter of Campbell, to be in sliding engagement with the stiffening member, as taught by Miraki, as the sliding engagement between the distal end of the

catheter and the stiffening member will allow the stiffening member to be freely movable axially for efficiently guiding the catheter to a target site in a patient's body (column 8, lines 60-63).

In further regards to claim 1, Campbell does not teach that the distal end of the stiffening member [18] comprises a retaining portion. Walker et al teaches a balloon catheter (Figure 31), wherein the distal end of a stiffening member (guide wire [22]) comprises a retaining portion (collar member [46] in the shape of a pierced sphere or ball member), the retaining portion having an exterior cross-sectional area that is greater than an interior cross-sectional area of a cannula (stop rib [239] of sleeve portion [42]) so as to prevent the distal end of the stiffening member from passing through the cannula, the retaining member being disposed between a distal end of the cannula and the distal terminus of a passageway (orifice [40]) of a sleeve [42]. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the stiffening member, of the catheter of Campbell, with a retaining portion that is disposed between a distal end of the cannula and the distal terminus of the passageway of the sleeve, as taught by Walker et al, as the retaining member will act as a stop means to limit the distal movement of the sleeve along the stiffening member by the engagement of the cannula with the retaining member (column 26, lines 32-37).

In regards to claim 2, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell teaches that the balloon [20] has a deflated axial length when deflated (Figure 4), and an inflated axial length when inflated (Figure 2), the deflated axial length and the inflated axial length each being defined by the distance between the proximal end

[24] and the distal end [26] of the balloon, the deflated axial length being different than the inflated axial length (Figures 2 and 4).

In regards to claim 3, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell teaches that the balloon [20] has a deflated axial length when deflated (Figure 4), and a partially inflated axial length when partially inflated (Figure 3), the deflated axial length and the partially inflated axial length each being defined by the distance between the proximal end [24] and the distal end [26] of the balloon, the deflated axial length being different than the partially inflated axial length (Figures 3-4).

In regards to claim 4, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell teaches that the balloon [20] has a partially inflated axial length when partially inflated (Figure 3), and a fully inflated axial length when fully inflated (Figure 2), the partially inflated axial length and the fully inflated axial length each being defined by the distance between the proximal end [24] and the distal end [26] of the balloon, the partially inflated axial length being different than the fully inflated axial length (Figures 2-3).

In regards to claim 5, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell teaches that the balloon wall comprises a non-elastic material (column 2, lines 33-34).

In regards to claim 6, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell teaches that the balloon wall comprises axially oriented creases or pleats (lobes [42]) to facilitate radial compression of the balloon [20] when deflated (Figure 4A).

In regards to claim 9, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell teaches that the lumen of the catheter [14] has a first cross-sectional area and the proximal portion of the stiffening member [18] has a second cross-sectional area, the second cross-sectional area being less than the first cross-sectional area so as to permit an inflation fluid to flow through the lumen between the connector [16] on the proximal end portion of the catheter and the interior volume of the balloon [20] (Figures 1-4).

In regards to claim 10, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell teaches that the distal end of the catheter [14] comprises a port to permit inflation fluid to flow between the lumen of the catheter and the interior volume of the balloon [20] (column 3, lines 40-43); however, Campbell is silent about whether the distal end of the catheter terminates within the interior volume of the balloon (Figure 1). Miraki teaches that the distal end of a catheter (shaft [32]) terminates within the interior volume of a balloon (balloon [132]) (Figures 6-7). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the distal end, of the modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, to terminate within the interior volume of the balloon, as taught by Miraki, as an obvious design choice to the user, as a distal end of a catheter can be placed within a balloon with the proximal end of the balloon about the distal end of the catheter (Figures 6-7) or the distal end of the catheter can be placed about the proximal end of a balloon.

In regards to claim 12, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell is silent about whether the distal end of the catheter [14] terminates within the interior volume of the balloon (Figure 1) and does not teach that the distal end of the

catheter is in sliding engagement with the stiffening member, since Campbell teaches that the distal end of the catheter [14] is fixedly connected to the stiffening member [46] (column 4, lines 1-7). Miraki teaches that the distal end of a catheter (shaft [32]) terminates within the interior volume of a balloon (balloon [132]) and the distal end of the catheter is in sliding engagement with a stiffening member (guide wire [12]). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the distal end, of the modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, to terminate within the interior volume of the balloon, as taught by Miraki, as an obvious design choice to the user, as a distal end of a catheter can be placed within a balloon with the proximal end of the balloon about the distal end of the catheter (Figures 6-7) or the distal end of the catheter can be placed about the proximal end of a balloon. It also would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the distal end, of the modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, to be in sliding engagement with the stiffening member, as taught by Miraki, as the sliding engagement between the distal end of the catheter and the stiffening member will allow the stiffening member to be freely movable axially for efficiently guiding the catheter to a target site in a patient's body (column 8, lines 60-63).

In regards to claims 16 and 17, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell does not teach a retaining portion. Walker et al teaches that the exterior cross-sectional area of the retaining portion (collar member [46] in the shape of a pierced sphere or ball member) is less than an interior cross-sectional area of the sleeve (sleeve portion [42]) so as to prevent the retaining member; however, Walker et al does

not teach the prevent of frictional engagement between the retaining member and the interior surface of the sleeve, as Walker does teach such a frictional engagement. However, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to reduce the diameter of the retaining portion to be both lesser in exterior cross-sectional area than the interior cross-sectional area of the sleeve and be greater in exterior cross-sectional area than the interior-cross-sectional area of the cannula, since such a change in shape of the retaining portion will still allow for movement of the distal end of the balloon along the stiffening member. In other words, whether the retaining portion engages the interior surface of the sleeve (i.e. retaining portion in current state of Walker et al) or whether the retaining portion does not engage the interior surface of the sleeve (i.e. the retaining portion in the modified form with a reduced diameter than Walker et al), the distal end of the balloon will sufficiently be able to move along the stiffening member.

In regards to claim 18, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell teaches that the distal end [26] of the balloon [20] comprises an end cap [22] affixed thereto, the sleeve being defined by the interior volume of the end cap (Figures 1-4).

In regards to claim 19, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell teaches an inflation device [32] for inflating or deflating said balloon [20], said inflation device being attached to the connector [16] on the proximal end portion of the catheter [14] (Figure 1).

In regards to claim 21, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell teaches that the stiffening member [46] comprises a solid wire having a circular cross-section (column 4, lines 25-27).

In regards to claim 22, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, in the current embodiment (Figures 1-6), Campbell does not teach that the stiffening member [18][46] comprises a lumen configured to accommodate the passage of a wire guide. However, Campbell teaches a further embodiment (Figures 7-8) wherein a stiffening member (tube member [86] with spanning region [88]) comprises a lumen configured to accommodate the passage of a wire guide (guidewire [82]). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the stiffening member, of the modified catheter of Campbell (Figures 1-6), Miraki, and Walker et al, with a lumen to accommodate the passage of a wire guide, as taught by the further embodiment of Campbell (Figures 7-8), as it is common practice in the art to place or position catheters in a patient's body over a wire guide (column 2, lines 18-19)(column 2, line 36).

10. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Weldon et al (US 5,419,765).

In regards to claim 20, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell teaches that the inflation device comprises a syringe [32] (Figures 1-4); however, Campbell is silent about whether the connector [16] comprises a female luer fitting and the syringe comprises a male luer fitting, the male luer fitting engaged with the

female luer fitting. Weldon et al teaches a balloon catheter (Figures 8-10), wherein a connector of the catheter (tube [56]) comprises a female luer fitting (female luer connector fitting [74]) and a syringe comprises a male luer fitting (male luer fitting [72]), the male luer fitting engaged with the female luer fitting (Figures 9-10). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the connector and syringe, of the modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, with female and male luer fittings, respectively, as taught by Weldon et al, as the luer-lock engagement of the male luer fitting of the syringe and the female luer fitting of the connector of the catheter will prevent the inadvertent separation of the syringe from the catheter (column 7, lines 61-68 to column 8, lines 1-6).

11. Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Campbell, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Swanson (US 5,605,543).

In regards to claims 23 and 24, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, Campbell is silent about whether the stiffening member [18] has a first physical property at a first location and a second physical property at a second location, wherein the first physical property is different from the second physical property. Swanson teaches a balloon catheter [10] (Figure 1) with a stiffening member (guidewire tube [20]) with a variance in the physical property of stiffness between two locations: the stiffening member is composed of a proximal guidewire tube [21] and a distal guidewire tube [22], with the proximal guidewire tube being stiffer than the distal guidewire tube (column 4, lines 43-52). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the stiffening member, of the

modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, with a variance in the physical property of stiffness between two locations, as taught by Swanson, in order to enhance the pushability of the resultant catheter since the proximal end is stiffer than the distal end (column 4, lines 53-55).

In regards to claim 25, in a modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, and Swanson, Campbell does not teach that the stiffening member [18] has a tapered cross-section. Miraki teaches a balloon catheter (Figures 5-7, balloon catheter [10]) wherein a stiffening member (guide wire [12]) has a tapered cross-section. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the stiffening member, of the modified catheter of Campbell, Miraki, Walker et al, and Swanson, to have a tapered cross-section, as taught by Miraki, as tapering of the stiffening member will provide an enhanced degree of flexibility toward the distal end of the stiffening member (column 14, lines 44-47).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed on September 30, 2010, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

In regards to claim 1, Applicant argues that Campbell does not teach the stiffening member being in sliding engagement with the distal end portion of the catheter (Reply, page 10). However, in the combination of Campbell, Miraki, and Walker et al, this feature is rendered obvious by Miraki such that the sliding engagement between the distal end of the catheter and the stiffening member will allow the stiffening member to be

freely movable axially for efficiently guiding the catheter to a target site in a patient's body (column 8, lines 60-63).

In regards to claim 1, Applicant argues that although the distal end of the core member [18] is disposed within a sleeve on the distal end of the balloon, it does not appear to be in sliding engagement within an interior surface of the sleeve (Reply, pages 10-11). Campbell teaches this feature since the sleeve [22] slides about the core member [18] (Figures 2-6).

In regards to claim 1, Applicant argues that in a combination of Campbell and Walker et al, the ball [46] of Walker et al is not a retaining member since distal movement of the ball beyond the end of the sleeve allows rapid deflation of the balloon and Walker et al is directed to a balloon having an open distal end with a removable seal (Reply, page 11). However, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). One must consider what the teachings of Walker et al would bring to Campbell. Campbell teaches a balloon having a closed, sealed distal end; hence, if the ball [46] of Walker et al is applied to the stiffening member of Campbell, as a retaining member, distal or proximal movement of the distal end of the balloon along the stiffening member would not deflate the balloon due to the closed, sealed distal end of Campbell. The benefit of the retaining member [46], of Walker, to the catheter, of Campbell, is that the retaining member will act as a stop means to limit the distal movement of the sleeve

along the stiffening member by the engagement of the cannula with the retaining member (column 26, lines 32-37).

Conclusion

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SHEFALI D. PATEL whose telephone number is (571) 270-3645. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8am-5pm Eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin C. Sirmons can be reached on (571) 272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Shefali D Patel/
Examiner, Art Unit 3767
11/24/2010
/KEVIN C. SIRMONS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3767